2nd March 1929].

Irrigation

Grievances of the ryots of Lalpet village regarding the lease of fish in the Viranam tank.

*1629 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the right to catch fish in the Viranam tank is leased out from year to year, and if so, to whom it was leased out and for what amounts during the last five years;

(b) whether the ryots of Lalpet village offered a considerably larger amount;

(c) whether it is a fact that the lessees drain the Viranam lake every year in order to get their full quantity of fish and whether the water in the lake ultimately wastes itself into the sea by such process;

(d) whether it is a fact that the ryots of Lalpet village have made representations to the subordinate authorities in the district and the Director of Fisheries complaining of the loss and suffering they are put to on account of the draining of the lake Viranam in the season when water is most required for their cultivation;

(e) if so, what action has been taken by the Government to prevent the wastage of the water of Viranam lake and if no action has yet been taken whether they propose to take any action in future;

(f) whether it is a fact that the ryots of Lalpet themselves offered to take up the lease of fish in the lake; and

(g) whether it was the usual practice with the Government until recently to lease out the fish in Viranam lake to the ryots of Lalpet and surrounding villages?

A.—A report has been called for.

Report on the investigation of the Kachalamma Tank project.

*1630 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state, in reference to answer to question No. 894 answered on 29th November 1928,—

(a) whether the Chief Engineer's report has been received; and
(b) if it has been received, what it is?

A.—(a) Yes.
(b) The Board of Revenue has recommended, on a consideration of the Chief Engineer's and Collector's reports, that the detailed investigation of the Project may be taken up. As the detailed investigation has already been made, a special staff has been sanctioned for the preparation of detailed plans and estimates.

Improvements to the head sluice at Vajjeswaram.

*1631 Q.—Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government are aware that the head sluice at Vajjeswaram in the Godavari Western delta is inadequate to allow sufficient supply of water to the wet ayacut in the delta;

[2nd March 1929

(*b*) if so, when that fact was brought to the notice of the Government; and

(*c*) what steps have since been taken to effect improvements to the said head sluice?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) In 1920.

(*c*) An estimate amounting to Rs. 1,21,000 for improvements to the Vajjeswaram head sluice is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr D. NARAYANA RAJU :—"May I know when the Government are going to finish consideration of this estimate?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I am glad that the hon. Member has put me this question. The estimate was received too late to be included in the budget and to include it in the budget hereafter it would be necessary to move for a further demand. There have been considerable objections raised in this House to the moving of further demands for grants. I am in great doubt whether I am to do so or not."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—"If there is objection for the Government moving further demands for grants, may I know what the Government are going to do? Will the work be seriously taken up at least next year?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Certainly, Sir, if the House will allow the further demand for grant?"

Expenditure on the Tungabhadra project.

* 1632 *Q.*—Mr. C. OBI REDDI : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with respect to the Tungabhadra project—

(*a*) what was the amount of money that was allotted and spent for the investigation of the project in the year 1927–28;

(*b*) what was the amount allotted and spent for the same in the year 1928–29; and

(*c*) whether any allotment has been made for the same in the budget for 1929–30 and if so, how much?

A.—(*a*) A sum of Rs. 25,000 was allotted, but only Rs. 2,003 was spent.

(*b*) Rs. 15,000 was originally allotted, but the appropriation has since been raised to Rs. 76,950. Against this an expenditure of Rs. 44,677 has been incurred to the end of December 1928 and the whole amount will it is expected be spent by 31st March next.

(*c*) A sum of Rs. [illegible],52,600 has been provided in the budget estimate for 1929–30 subject to the vote of the Legislative Council.

Action taken on the memorial of the mirasidars of Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks.

*1633 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA : With reference to question No. 461 answered on 10th October 1928, regarding the memorial submitted to His Excellency the Governor by the ryots and mirasidars of kadarambam parts of the Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks, will the hon the Member for Revenue be pleased to state what action has been taken by Government on the above memorial?